UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,710	07/29/2004	Stanley C. Antosh	41260.003	4709

21907 7590 12/05/2007

ROZSA LAW GROUP LC
18757 BURBANK BOULEVARD
SUITE 220
TARZANA, CA 91356-3346

EXAMINER	
KUDLA, JOSEPH S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1614	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
12/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/710,710	ANTOSH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph S. Kudla	1614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 September 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *18-19 and 22* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of the election requirement in the reply filed on 9/24/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that inventions are not patently distinct. This is not found persuasive because the search for inventions inclusive of vitamins, coenzymes, mineral substances, amino acids, herbs, creatine compounds and antioxidants involves divergent subject matter between the various inventions and would require a separate search for each.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.

(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
(1) Field of the Invention.
(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Content of Specification

(a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.

(b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.

(c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.

(d) The Names Of The Parties To A Joint Research Agreement: See 37 CFR 1.71(g).

(e) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)),

and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.

(f) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:

(1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."

(2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."

(g) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

(h) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.

(i) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly

complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

(j) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).

(k) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).

(l) Sequence Listing, See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

2. The Specification as set forth is not in the proper format. Specification headings should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type. Some section headings are missing such as Cross-References to Related Applications, Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development and The Names Of The Parties To A Joint Research Agreement. If a section heading from the above listed guidance is present and no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should

follow the section heading. Additionally under Background of Invention, the information on class, field of search, and references cited should be removed.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: At paragraph 111, line 8, separate the words "maintain" and "physiological." At paragraph 111. line 16, separate the words "and" and "adenosine." At paragraph, 115, line 6, separate the words "high" and " and." At paragraph 115, line 7, define "in State 3." At paragraph 142, line 5, complete parentheses around "mGPDH."

Claim Objections

4. Claims 18-19 and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities: The words "currently amended" do not precede the amended claim language enclosed in parentheses indicating a change has taken place.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101 and 112 2nd paragraph

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under

35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd.* v. *Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4 provide for the use of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claims 1-4 recite the limitation "the use" in the second line of all mentioned claims.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claims 3-4 recite the limitation "said effects" in the second line of all mentioned claims.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claims 7-8, 10-11 and 16-17 recite the limitation "the salt" or "the salts" in the claims.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 9 recites the limitation "analogs of these compounds" in the first line of the claim.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claims 12-15 and 23-26 recite the limitation "the form" in the first line of all mentioned claims.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

12. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The indication of the group or subject to be treated and the indication for which treatment is given is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the claim. As an example, Claim 1 could be remedied

by the addition of a subject or group to which the invention could be administered along with a statement that the therapy is given to increase energy production.

Appropriate action is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

13. Claims 18-19 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant claims "creatine analogs." Because the instant specification does not provide written description or give examples of what structures are meant for such "creatine analogs," the phrase "creatine analogs" lacks adequate written description.

Appropriate action is required.

14. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of increasing muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal with use of any form of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid *nor* does the specification provide for a method of increasing methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid levels in a mammal or the effects of administering these compounds *nor* does the specification reasonably provide for administration of a drug composition *nor* does the specification reasonably provide for the administration of a second compound, a creatine analog. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims without undue experimentation to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal with use of any form of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid as outlined in the claims.

Undue experimentation is a conclusion reached by weighing the noted factual considerations set forth below as seen in *In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)*. A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding a fair evaluation of an appropriate combination of the factors below, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

These factors include:
(A) The breadth of the claims;
(B) The nature of the invention;
(C) The state of the prior art;
(D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
(E) The level of predictability in the art;
(F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
(G) The existence of working examples; and
(H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The breadth of the claims

The breadth of the instant claims is very broad with relation to the ability of any monovalent or divalent or substrate form of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid, with or without a creatine analog, to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal. The breadth of the instant claims is narrow with relation to the ability of increasing methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid levels in a mammal and with administering the compounds orally or infused. Applicant has not provided sufficient evidence or mechanism of action to support claims drawn to the administration via any means of any monovalent or divalent or substrate form of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal. The breadth of the claims exacerbates the complex nature of the subject matter to which the present claims are directed.

The nature of the invention

Claims 1-2 are directed to a method of use of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a

mammal. Claims 3-4 are directed to a method of increasing methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid levels in a mammal or the effects of administering these compounds. Claims 5-10, 12-17, 20-21 and 23-28 are directed toward the mode of administration, the form of administration, the amount administered and the form the methyl pyruvate compounds that are administered. Claims 11, 18-19, 22 and 29-30 are directed to the co-administration of a second compound, a coenzyme or a creatine analog.

The state of the prior art

The state of the prior art does not show the use methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal.

Relative skill of those in the art

The relative skill of those in the art is high, generally that of a PhD with several years of practical experience. Thus, the ones of skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made would have been capable of accessing the therapeutic effect of the individual compounds, determining an administration route and formulating a dosage and dosage schedule.

The level of predictability in the art

The instant claimed invention is highly unpredictable. It has not been established in the prior art or by applicant that the administration of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid, via sidestepping the first step in glycolysis, is able to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration or performance in a mammal. Due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that the invention is required to be assessed for physiological activity by *in vitro* and *in vivo* screening to determine which form of the methyl pyruvate compounds or methyl pyruvic acid compound exhibit the desired pharmacological activity. The lack of *any* guidance from the present specification or prior art with regard to the actual administration of *any* form of methyl pyruvate compounds or methyl pyruvic acid compound in a mammal with the intention of showing an administration route and dosage, showing that methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid levels and effects are increased in a mammal and that the methyl pyruvate compounds or pyruvic acid compound are capable of increasing muscle energy production, muscle respiration or performance in a mammal makes practicing the claimed invention unpredictable.

The existence of these obstacles establishes that the contemporary knowledge in the art would prevent one of ordinary skill in the art from accepting any therapeutic regimen on its face. *In re Fisher, 427 F. 2d, 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970)*, indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. Hence, one of skill in the art is unable to fully predict possible results from the administration of the compound.

The amount of direction provided by the Applicant and The existence of working examples

The instant specification is not seen to provide adequate guidance, which would allow the skilled artisan to extrapolate from the disclosure, to use the claimed method commensurate in the scope with the instant claims. No examples exist of administering the pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid *in vivo*. Without administering the compound to a mammal, one cannot predict if methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid levels and effects are increased in a mammal or determine the administration route, dosages and frequency of dosing. With no results, it is difficult to envision that the compounds instantly claimed can increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal.

A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation (*In re Wright, 999 F. 2d 1557, 1562; 27 USPQ 2d 1510, 1514 (Fed. Cir. 1993)*). The specification lacks sufficient disclosure to support applicant's claims of a method of increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal by administration of any form of methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid. There is not seen sufficient working examples or data from references on the prior art providing a nexus between that which applicant asserts as proof of a method of increasing muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal.

The quantity of experimentation needed to make and use the invention based on the content of the disclosure

Based on the unpredictable nature of the invention, the state of the prior art and the breadth of the claims, one skilled in the art could not use the claimed invention without undue experimentation. The essential element towards the validation of a therapeutic capable of performing the mechanism of action is the ability to test the compound on cells *in vitro* monitored in advance of administration of a compound and link those results with subsequent histological results. Once it can be documented that that each of the compounds of interest elicits a desired pharmacological response, such as increased metabolism, the compounds could then be tested in an animal model.

With respect to the *in vivo* treatment of a mammal with the instant compound to increase muscle energy production, muscle respiration and performance in a mammal, absent a reasonable *a priori* expectation of success for using a specific drug regime, one skilled in the art would have to extensively test the drug regime. Since each prospective embodiment would have to be empirically tested, and those which initially failed tested further, an undue amount of experimentation would be required to practice the invention as it is claimed in its current scope, because the specification provides inadequate guidance to do otherwise.

Based on the unpredictable nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, and the extreme breadth of the claims, one skilled in the art could not use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

U.S Non- Provisional Application No.10/710830

15. Claims 1-2, 5-17 and 20-28 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-2, 5-17 and 20-28 of copending Application No. 10/710830. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both the independent claims (claims 1 and 2) of U.S Non- Provisional Application No.10/710830 and the independent claims in the instant application (claims 1 and 2)

reads on anyone being administered methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid. The remainder of the claims are verbatim for both applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

U.S Non- Provisional Application No.10/711255

16. Claims 1-17 and 20-28 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 and 23-31 of copending Application No. 10/711255. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the independent claims (claims 1-4) of U.S Non- Provisional Application No.10/711255 and the independent claims in the instant application (claims 1-4) reads on anyone being administered methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid. The remainder of the claims are verbatim for both applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

U.S Non- Provisional Application No.10/904648

17. Claims 1-17 and 20-28 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 and 23-31 of copending Application No.10/904648. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the independent

claims (claims 1-4) of U.S Non- Provisional Application No. 10/904648 and the independent claims in the instant application (claims 1-4) reads on anyone being administered methyl pyruvate or methyl pyruvic acid. The remainder of the claims are verbatim for both applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph S. Kudla whose telephone number is (571) 270-3288. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JK

Ardin H. Marschel 12/4/07

ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER